2-8-6-82

HALL OF RECORDS

ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND



MASTER PLAN OF

REGIONAL STATE PARKS AND RECREATION AREAS

IN MARYLAND

(As approved by the Master Plan Committee on State Parks)

PART I

Department of Forests and Parks in cooperation with Maryland State Planning Department

January 1962

er victoria. Per occino especio respectoria de recentencia. Occino dell'especio

Control of the Control of the the Book of the Control of the Contr

. .

and the green of the state of t

MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE ON STATE PARKS

January 30, 1962

To The Honorable
J. Millard Tawes
Governor of the State of Maryland

To The Honorable Members of the General Assembly Annapolis, Maryland

Gentlemen:

Pursuant to the provisions of Joint Resolution No. 38, approved by the General Assembly of Maryland and the Governor in May 1961, the Master Plan Committee on State Parks, is pleased to transmit herewith copy of Part I of the report "Master Plan of Regional State Parks and Recreation Areas in Maryland."

The report is based upon a comprehensive study of State park and development needs made by the Department of Forests and Parks, which employed Mr. James F. Evans, formerly director of the New York State Park System, as consultant on the project. The work was carried out with the cooperation of the State Planning Department and the Master Plan Committee for State Parks appointed by the Governor. The Committee's task was to supervise and assist in the development of the Master Plan.

Part I of the report treats needed administrative revisions and State policies, sets forth a classification scheme, State park criteria, and general priority considerations, and designates the areas selected for inclusion in the Master Plan. The Master Plan Committee has approved this part of the report and believes that it makes a significant contribution toward achieving an excellent State park system.

Part II of the report will comprise detailed descriptions of the areas selected in Part I, including the types of development to be provided in each area, estimated project costs, and a recommended 10-year schedule of projects to carry out the plan. While considerable work on the second part of the report has been accomplished, time available did not permit its completion for submittal to the 1962 session of the General Assembly.

It is recommended, therefore, that the Master Plan Committee on State Parks be continued in order to supervise and assist in the completion of the report. The full report will be prepared and submitted to the Legislative Council prior to the 1963 session of the General Assembly. Your approval of this recommendation is respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,

/S/ Joseph F. Kaylor

Chairman, Master Plan Committee on State Parks

MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE ON STATE PARKS

Joseph F. Kaylor, <u>Chairman</u> Director, Department of Forests and Parks

Hon. Bernard I. Gonder Senator, Garrett County

Hon. William M. Houck Delegate, Frederick County

Hon. C. Clifton Virts Delegate, Frederick County

Samuel L. Hammerman

James G. Rennie
Director, Department of Budget
and Procurement

Hon. Charles M. See Senator, Allegany County

Hon. J. Grahame Walker Delegate, Montgomery County

Hon. Charles W. Coss * Delegate, Washington County

Morris Mechanic

James J. O'Donnell Director, State Planning Department

^{*} Resigned as member of the House of Delegates, September 1961

٠.,		
٠.		
\$15.		
	e are emili	
· 1. 1	in the second of	and the second of the second o

and the second of the second process of the second of the

and √ sure and a sure of the sure of

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS (To be prepared after PART II is completed)

PART I

- A. POPULATION DATA
- B. TRENDS IN PARK USAGE
- C. GENERAL APPRAISAL OF PROBLEM Lack of development Administrative problems
- D. MASTER PLAN FOR STATE PARKS
 State Policies
 Classification of Areas
 State Park Criteria
 Areas Selected For Inclusion in Master Plan
 Other Areas
 General Priority Considerations
- PART II (To be completed prior to 1963 session of General Assembly)
 - A. AREA DESCRIPTIONS
 - B. SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED TOTAL COST
 - C. RECOMMENDED 10-YEAR PROGRAM
 - D. ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS

V.

 $\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \right) \right) \right)}{1} \right) \right) \right)} \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right)} \right) \right) \right)}$

INTRODUCTION

The Master Plan of Regional State Parks and Recreation Areas set forth in this report has been prepared in accordance with Joint Resolution No. 38 (House Joint Resolution No. 53) which was approved during the 1961 Session of the General Assembly of Maryland.

Under the terms of the Resolution, the Department of Forests and Parks was to prepare a comprehensive Master Plan for a State park system in cooperation with the State Planning Department. That said Master Plan shall set forth principles and policies governing the location, size and development of State parks; establish criteria for parks and recreation areas; and establish a workable and logical program of priorities for land acquisition and development of a park system. The Resolution further authorized employment of a consultant to conduct the study and called for the setting up of a committee to supervise and assist in the development of the Master Plan.

In accordance thereto a Master Plan Committee on State Parks was appointed by Governor Tawes, the membership of which committee, listed elsewhere in this report, included members of the General Assembly, business leaders, and heads of several State departments. Mr. James F. Evans, formerly director of the New York State Park System, was employed as consultant on the project.

In carrying out his assignment, the Consultant reviewed all pertinent information and data in the files of the Department of Forests and Parks, toured the State with members of the Department, and inspected all existing and potential parks and recreation areas brought to his attention by the Department. All of the information assembled, coupled with the advice and comments of the Consultant, was discussed and carefully studied by the Master Plan Committee in its task of selecting the areas included in the Master Plan. Neither the Consultant nor the Committee felt they were bound by the former Master Plan published in 1952. On the contrary the Consultant was instructed to take a fresh look at the State's recreation needs in terms of existing areas and new ones to serve best the population of the State.

Developed on the basis of a report prepared and submitted by the Consultant, Part I of the Master Plan presented herein has been approved by the Master Plan Committee insofar as administrative revisions, policies, classification, criteria, areas selected, and general priority considerations are concerned. Part II of this report (to be completed prior to the 1963 session of the General Assembly) will include detailed descriptions of the selected areas referred to in Part I, project cost estimates, and the recommended 10-year program.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

(To be prepared after PART II has been completed)

PART I

A. POPULATION DATA

Maryland's population has shown a steady increase since 1900, as shown in table I. The percentage increase has been substantially greater in the two decades since 1940 than in previous periods, and in the period between 1950 and 1960, Maryland's growth has been second only to that of Florida on the East Coast.

Table I
Population of Maryland 1900 - 1960

<u>Year</u>	<u>Population</u>	% Increase
1960	3,100,689	32.3
1950	2,343,001	28.6
1940	1,821,244	11.6
1930	1,631,526	12.5
1920	1,449,661	11.9
1910	1,295,346	9.0
1900	1,188,044	

Table II shows the population changes by county in Maryland for the years 1920 to 1960. The counties with the greatest percentage gain are Montgomery, Prince Georges, Baltimore, Anne Arundel, and Howard. Other counties in the New York to Washington corridor also show large gains. All the counties noted are part of the Baltimore-Washington metropolitan areas.

Table II

Maryland Population by County 1920 - 1960

County	1960	1950	<u>1940</u>	1930	1920	% Change 1950-1960
Allegany	84,169	89,556	86,973	79,098	69,938	-6.0
Anne Arundel	206,634	117,392	68,375	55,167	43,408	76.0
Baltimore	492,428	270,273	155,825	124,565	74,817	82.2
Baltimore City	939,024	949,708	859,100	804,874	733,826	-1.1
Calvert	15,826	12,100	10,484	9,528	9,744	30.8
Caroline	19,462	18,234	17,549	17,387	18,652	6.7
Carroll	52,785	44,907	39,054	35,978	34,245	17.5
Cecil	48,408	33,356	26,407	25,827	23,612	45.1
Charles	32,572	23,415	17,612	16,166	17,705	39.1
Dorchester	29,666	27,815	28,006	26,813	27,895	6.7
Frederick	71,930	62,287	<i>5</i> 7, <i>3</i> 12	54,440	52,541	15.5
Garrett	20,420	21,259	21,981	19,908	19,678	-4.0
Harford	76,722	51,78 2	35,060	31,603	29,291	48.2
Howard	36,152	23,119	17,175	16,169	15,826	56.4
Kent	15,481	13,677	13,465	14,242	15,026	13.2
Montgomery	340,928	164,401	83,912	49,206	34,921	107.4
Prince George 's	357,395	194,182	89,490	60,095	43,347	84.1
Queen Anne's	16,569	14,579	14,476	14,571	16,001	13.6

(continued on next page)

er e		
· · •		
÷		
	•	

Table II (Continued)

	1960	1950	1940	1930	1920	% Change 1950-1960
St. Mary's	38,915	29,111	14,626	15,189	16,112	33.7
Somerset	19,623	20,745	20,965	23,382	24,602	
Talbot	21,578	19,428	18,784	18,583	18,306	
Washington	91,219	78,886	68,838	65,882	59,694	
Wicomico	49,050	39,641	34,530	31,229	28,16	
Worcester	23,733	23,148	21,245	21,624	22,309	
Total	3,100,689	2,343,001	1,821,244	1,631,526	1,449,661	32.3

Urban Areas

Two major urban areas are found in Maryland in the Baltimore and Washington Metropolitan Regions. For the purpose of this report, the Baltimore Metropolitan Region conforms with the political subdivisions represented in the Baltimore Regional Planning Council. These consist of Baltimore City, Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Harford and Howard Counties. The Washington Metropolitan Area as used here consists of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties.

The Baltimore Metropolitan Region consists of 2261 square miles, or about 23% of the land area of the state. In this region is concentrated about 58% of the total population of the state, averaging 754 people per square mile in 1960.

The Washington Metropolitan Region consists of 983 square miles, or about 10% of the land area of the state. Within this area lives 22.5% of the State's total population, averaging 713 people per square mile in 1960. It should also be remembered that the District of Columbia also affects park usage in this general area.

The two metropolitan areas combined represent 33% of the State's land area, and contain slightly over 80% of the total population of Maryland.

Smaller urban areas are found in the Cumberland, Hagerstown, Frederick, and Salisbury areas, and Cecil County comes under the influence of the Wilmington area, and the heavy industrialization and urbanization of the lower Delaware River Valley.

.

Future Growth

Comparison of current population figures with those of 1940 and 1950 shows the explosive nature of Maryland's population surge, and future estimates from the best available sources indicate a continuation of this trend.

Every indication is that the population growth of the cities of Baltimore and Washington is tending to stabilize, while the suburban areas will continue to grow at almost fantastic rates.

Similarly, the population growth of the state as a whole will continue at a high rate, as shown in Table V, and probably will exceed four million by 1980.

Table III
Baltimore Metropolitan District
Population and Future Forecasts

Subdivision	<u>1950</u>	1960	<u>1965(</u> 1)	<u>1970</u> (1)	<u>1980</u> (2)
Anne Arundel County Baltimore County	117,392 270,273	206,634 492,428	248,000 588,600	290,000 685,600	750,000
Baltimore City	949,708	939,024	935,400	941,500	1,200,000
Carroll County Harford County	44,907 51,782	52,785 76,722	56,800 91,800	59,700 108,400	80,000 140,000
Howard County	23,119	36,152	42,200	49,500	70,000

⁽¹⁾ Maryland Population Forecasts, 1965 and 1970. Maryland State Planning Department, 1961.

Table IV
Washington Metropolitan District
Population and Future Forecasts

Subdivision	<u>1950</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1965</u> (1)	<u>1970</u> (1)	<u>1980</u> (2)
Montgomery County Prince George's County	164,401	340,928	415,600	506,200	560,000
	194,182	357,395	433,200	527,800	593,000

⁽¹⁾ Maryland Population Forecasts, 1965 and 1970. Maryland State Planning Department, 1961.

⁽²⁾ Anticipated Growth, Chapter III of an unpublished manuscript, Baltimore Regional Planning Council, 1959.

⁽²⁾ The Mass Transportation Survey Staff, National Capital Planning Commission and National Capital Regional Planning Council, File Number MTS 27, 1957.

·	
·	

			•				

			:	
•	· ·			

Table V
State of Maryland
Population and Future Forecasts

<u> 1950</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1965</u> (1)	<u>1970</u> (1)		
2,343,001	3,100,689	3,446,000	3,838,000		

(1) Maryland Population Forecasts, 1965 and 1970. Maryland State Planning Department, 1961.

To meet the needs of the increasing population of the State will require expanded recreational opportunities, especially in the form of intensive development of our park and recreation areas to provide for broadest public use. This is particularly true in the Baltimore and Washington Metropolitan Areas in which 80 per cent of the State's population is concentrated.

B. TRENDS IN PARK USAGE

Use of Maryland's state parks shows a steady increase since attendance records were first kept in 1937. Fluctuations may be noted from year to year, due to adverse weather conditions, economic conditions, and other factors.

A summary of attendance in state parks and state forest recreation areas is noted below.

Year	Acreas Park Land	Attendance
1941	3803	705,004
1942	3803	452,706
1943	3803	238,421
1944	4010	373,445
1945	4042	242,619
1946	4042	459,204
1947	4043	658,074
1948	4144	751,855
1949	4819	858,100
1950	4970	776,669
1951	5006	1,108,759
1952	5242	1,173,865
1953	5307	1,896,262
1954	10239	2,347,695
1955	11327	2,340,901
1956	13620	3,207,451
1957	15093	4,001,175
1958	16550	5,744,101
1959	16853	5,310,178
1960	18122	3,813,439

During the decade from 1941-50, there was an increase in park land of 1167 acres or 30% and attendance increased 10%. However, in the next decade, 1951-60, park land increased 13,152 acres or 265%, while attendance increased 391% over the same period.

Attendance increased in all categories, but the greatest percentage increase in the last decade has been in family camping.

All indications are that attendance will continue to rise in parks and recreation areas. Dwindling open space areas, increased population, better roads, increasing leisure time, and more disposable income will all contribute to a greater use of Maryland's state parks and recreation areas.

C. GENERAL APPRAISAL OF PROBLEM

It should be quite unnecessary to elaborate on the pressing need for additional recreation areas and facilities in Maryland. Practically every State in the Nation is faced with the same problem. The major factors contributing to and comprising this exigency may be attributed to:

- (1) "exploding" population;
- (2) general increase in leisure time;
- (3) tremendous growth in motor traffic;
- (4) shorter work week;
- (5) growth in the per capita so-called "disposable income";
- (6) growth in the general public desire and need for recreation and the outdoors;
- (7) tremendous increase in land values, especially in the urban areas.

The rapid disappearance of open space, and of shore front available to the public, has forced upon the responsible public officials an acute awareness that it is "Now or Never".

Robert Moses, Chairman of the New York State Council of Parks and head of the New York State Park System and recognized as the foremost park authority in the Nation, writing recently in a county government publication on this subject, said:

"No one is going to stop the continuing concentration of urban and suburban population. It requires no deep thinking, no big words, no philosophizing about urban growth, change and decay, no ecological research,

 $(x, x) = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$

no planetary speculation to save from the outward march of cities what is left of the open country. While artistic renderings of academically planned cities complete with circumferential belts of green, come off the presses in steady succession without follow-ups or realization, the developers of subdivisions and shopping centers are cutting up and loading the last available acres of land with costly improvements.

"Because time ran out on planning of this sort we proposed the State Park Bond Issue, overwhelmingly approved by the voters. It had become evident that when all the land available for recreation is gone, formulas based on people per acre are futile."

Maryland is on the threshold of such a dilemma and a year or two of delay could be disastrous to the land acquisition program.

The State of Maryland has several major problems which should be remedied in the immediate future.

The first such problem is the lack of good sand beach frontage. There are three answers to this: one is Assateague Island which would provide ocean frontage and a beautiful beach, the second is Point Lookout on both the Potomac and Chesapeake Bay, and the third is in the area below Annapolis and north of Point Lookout in the vicinity of the West and Rhode Rivers. The first two areas, while perhaps not as accessible to the large centers of population as would be desirable, are so outstanding that there should not be the slightest question that they should be acquired immediately. The third area is in the same category but in addition would be very accessible to population centers. All three should be preserved forever for the people of Maryland. Assateague Island and Point Lookout should be acquired at once and the third area should be selected and acquired as soon as feasible.

The second deficiency is the lack of development within the existing parks and recreation areas of the State Department of Forests and Parks. The Department has approximately 119,000 acres in State forests. Within these State forests lie approximately 550 acres of developed State forest recreation areas. By far the greater part of these areas does not lend itself to recreational development due to its rugged character and the consequent excessive cost of development.

In addition, and aside from the State forests, there are more than 18,000 acres designated as State Parks. However, administrative problems, including too small a design and development staff, have delayed a proper development program. Some of the finest holdings are so underdeveloped as to be incapable of serving the present patronage, to say nothing of the future.

Access to the State's holdings is, generally speaking, quite good. There are a few minor exceptions which can be rather easily remedied, and access in itself presents no particular problem.

A third major problem here in Maryland, as it is in so many regions, is the question of controlling pollution in the rivers and streams. Such pollution detracts immeasurably from the use of park and recreational facilities bordering such major rivers as the Patapsco and Potomac among others. Eliminating this pollution, not only in order to enhance the use of our recreational areas, but to safeguard the general health as well, must be a continuing major goal of responsible State agencies. To this end, the State Health Department, the Water Pollution Control Commission, and the Department of Forests and Parks must work in unison to detect and correct sources of pollution, and to strengthen laws and regulations that will assure high-level quality of stream and river water. Until this pollution

is controlled satisfactorily, the State of Maryland will be unable to realize the full recreational potential of its Forests and Parks land holdings.

To accomplish a more efficient operation of State Parks by the Department of Forests and Parks, certain other problems, administrative in nature, must be recognized and handled. Most important among these are the following:

- 1. Park and recreation areas within State Forests should be managed completely by Parks personnel under Park controls and regulations, rather than by Forestry personnel, as is the present practice. The Master Plan Committee strongly urges the Commission of Forests and Parks to effectuate this recommendation immediately by means of a Commission order.
- 2.An adequate technical staff both numerically and in diversification, must be provided for the State Parks. This applies particularly to personnel capable of planning park development and executing programs implementing such development. The Forests and Parks Commission and its Director should take aggressive action to provide for adequate staffing, including studies of personnel needs, salary scales, training programs, and the like.
- 3. Continuing vigorous efforts should be made to improve procedures for expediting the design and letting of contracts for public improvements in the State Parks in order to accelerate the expenditure of appropriations earmarked for State Park and Recreation Area development.

In these activities much can be accomplished by a spirit of understanding, cooperation, and mutual respect between the Department of Forests and Parks and the Department of Public Improvements which has certain legal, technical, and administrative responsibilities in these areas.

It is understood that, within the framework of present practice, the

Department of Forests and Parks may solicit bids locally for certain improvements and development programs; may adapt "stock" or standardized plans developed

and the control of th and the second of the second o and the control of th the second of -.

Market and the control of the contro

jointly by the Department of Forests and Parks and the Department of Public Improvements; may handle much of its own supervision and inspection on minor projects; and may have consulting architectural and engineering personnel, retained through the Department of Public Improvements, for design of large-scale and for specialized projects. Everything possible should be done to recognize and use these and other available devices to facilitate the execution and completion of the State Parks programs.

4. Because of large appropriations in recent years for <u>land acquisition</u> for State parks and recreation areas, and indications of continuing high-level needs in the area in the immediate future, procedures for <u>land acquisition</u> must be developed and refined on a continuing basis to the highest possible degree. Activity in this area calls for not only swift and orderly acquisition practices, but for utmost care and business acumen in spending wisely large sums of public funds.

Present practice channels all land transactions of the State, except those of the State Roads Commission, through Department of Public Improvements for review and submission to the Board of Public Works. This centralizes, for control and standardization, all land transactions within this one agency. In this function the Department of Public Improvements establishes certain procedures and forms for appraisals, options, surveys, deeds, title searches, etc. It carries out actual negotiations and completes transactions for all agencies except Forests and Parks and, of course, the Roads Commission.

Forests and Parks, conforming to the procedures and forms established by Department of Public Improvements, and practices fixed by its Forests and Parks Commission, carries on negotiations and other land acquisition operations with its own personnel. They then turn over the developed results to Department of Public Improvements for review and submission to the Board of Public Works.

In this activity, the Director of Forests and Parks, the Superintendent of Parks, and other administrative personnel of the Department have been the prime functionaries — doing this work along with their other responsibilities. It would simplify and expedite the whole procedure if Forests and Parks had technical personnel specifically designated for land acquisition activity on a full-time basis. The Forests and Parks personnel should work as closely as possible with Department of Public Improvements' "property acquisition" section, constantly reviewing and improving these operations to conform to practical needs.

Over and above this consideration, land acquisition procedures of Forests and Parks should be fortified with "quick taking" procedures where such are necessary to supplement the Department's existing condemnation authority.

5. Elsewhere in this report is a discussion of "Historical Sites" as a part of the Parks system. This part of the Parks program should have the direct full-time benefit and attention of a competent, practical person with a background of historical experience and some museum knowledge — a person who can assist the Forests and Parks Commission and Director with able technical knowledge in this field.

These considerations listed here, together with others not necessarily mentioned, should give the Department of Forests and Parks the tools with which to carry out with speed and diligence a Parks development program, based on a system of priorities, which in a few years can give Maryland a Park system its citizens can be proud of.

D. MASTER PLAN FOR STATE PARKS

STATE POLICIES

In its deliberations concerning the development of a master plan, the Master Plan Committee for State Parks agreed upon some basic State policies regarding recreation areas which are proposed and have been followed herein. These concepts, set forth below, shall serve as a guide for the development and operation of the State's park system.

- 1. State policy shall be to concentrate upon the establishment of a park system which will be comprised basically of a number of large regional parks, having significant scenic and recreational value, and development potential to attract the public.
- 2. State policy shall be to develop a regional park or other area to its fullest recreational potential for public use as rapidly as possible.
- 3. The Commission and Department of Forests and Parks shall levy reasonable charges in State parks and other areas commensurate with the specific recreational facilities and services provided and used.
- 4. State policy shall be to re-evaluate the Master Plan periodically to determine its adequacy in relation to changing need.
- 5. Proposals for additional parks or recreation areas, including donations of property, shall not be accepted by the Department of Forests and Parks prior to joint approval by the Commission of Forests and Parks and the State Planning Department.
- 6. It shall be contrary to State policy for the State to engage in the provision and operation of lodging and restaurant facilities.

In this connection, such facilities, when desirable, could be provided by the operators, and plans for such a facility should be approved by the Department of Forests and Parks. This statement of policy does not preclude provision of the type of concession buildings as are presently operated in the State park system.

Moreover, additional cabins for rental to the public shall not be provided in State parks and recreation areas.

- 7. Under Chapter 63 of the Laws of Maryland of 1960, the Department of Forests and Parks is authorized to acquire easements on property to preserve open spaces and areas for public use and enjoyment, rather than acquiring full title to the land. State policy shall be to make fullest possible use of this authority.
- 8. Under Title VII of the Federal Housing Act of 1961, States and local public bodies are eligible to receive grants from the Housing and Home Finance Agency to defray part of the cost of acquiring title to or controlling rights in permanent open space land. The amount of such grant may not exceed 20 per cent of costs, except in cases of public bodies having broad area responsibilities when this limit may be increased to 30 per cent. As a matter of State policy, it is recommended that the Department of Forests and Parks shall make every effort to obtain such grants in suitable instances.

CLASSIFICATION OF AREAS

In order to provide for a systematic development of State recreation areas, the Master Plan Committee on State Parks gave careful consideration to a classification scheme that would be meaningful, not complex, and which would lend emphasis to the concepts set forth under its recommended policies. Such a means of identification is of value to legislators, State officials, and especially to the public.

There was unanimous agreement in the fundamental objective to designate a system of parks which would serve the State as a whole, with special emphasis first given to a regional type of park, rather than continue a pattern which includes small, inadequate and locally oriented areas. The regional type of park should be at a location to serve a large, or potentially large, population segment and should provide sufficient area, recreational features and other attractions for broad popular appeal. It should provide such special features for public use as swimming, boating, fishing (either by natural available water or impounding), camping, picnic areas, playfields and, of course, the necessary roads, parking and sanitary facilities. In sum, a regional park should have exceptional scenic or recreational values and development potential, including water-based activities, that would justify intensive development and broadest public use.

Areas having less potential, both in way of size and development possibilities, yet offering good recreational opportunities, should be designated as recreation areas rather than parks, and would be developed to meet more limited activities in contrast to all-purpose park usage.

Still other areas having historical significance should be considered historic sites. Such sites should be restricted only to those having State-wide or national significance. In the future, prior to consideration of any proposal for additional historic sites, such proposals should be concurred in by the Maryland Historical Trust.

The establishment and acceptance of these three types of areas (1) regional parks, (2) recreation areas, and (3) historic sites was considered the keystone of the evaluation of the various existing and potential sites.

The Committee further concluded that the Master Plan should include only areas having potential as parks and recreation areas and should not embrace other types of areas including watersheds, conservation areas, forests and other specialties. Also, that continued acquisition by the State of free-ranging, elongated watershed areas for park use is a very costly procedure and should not be adopted as a regular policy.

The Committee agreed that in many instances there was no justification for absolute continuity in park and recreation property, especially where high land costs and difficulty of acquisition prevail. And it further agreed that development need not encompass the entire acreage of a park but rather that intensified development should be carried out in specific, selected areas of a park or recreation area on a priority basis.

Finally, the Committee agreed that areas of small acreage and limited potential presently held by the State should not be continued as State responsibilities, but should be turned over to a county or other local subdivision.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF AREAS

Having determined upon a broad classification scheme for State parks and recreation areas, the Master Plan Committee next established some criteria to guide in the selection of such areas. In general, the Committee felt strongly that the State park system should encompass only those areas of sufficient size and number, each with outstanding recreational potential, to serve the prospective needs of the people in each region of the State, leaving to local government responsibility for other areas primarily of local interest.

Among the key factors considered in establishing needed criteria were:

(1) minimum acreage, (2) accessibility, (3) adaptability, (4) availability of water for recreational use, (5) distribution and balance, and (6) cost of land and development. The specific criteria adopted follow:

Regional State Park - 1. A regional State park site should be readily accessible to a large, or potentially large, segment of the population, should preferably contain scenic values and, above all, should be susceptible to the fullest possible recreational development.

- 2. The site should include not less than 400 acres of land and should provide at least 35 to 40 acres of water usable for recreational purposes, either through a natural body of water or impoundment. Only in extraordinary cases shall there be any compromise in these area requirements for regional parks.
- 3. The site should be well outside the limits of cities or large towns, should be attractive to the people of the State in general, or should serve a large metropolitan area. It is not always essential that there be continuity in park and recreation property.
- 4. A site possessing a good percentage of wooded areas or with a stream, lake or ocean frontage is particularly desirable.
- 5. A regional State park should provide facilities for swimming, boating, fishing, camping, picnicking, and playgrounds, along with adequate provision of roads, parking areas, and sanitary facilities to serve the public.

- 6. The value of a regional park or recreation area is enhanced if it contains historical features, but such features are incidental not controlling.
- 7. In the development of a regional park, there is no need to develop the total acreage; intensive development should be carried out in specific, selected areas on a priority basis.
- 8. Requirements for additional parks and recreation areas must become increasingly strict so as to preclude interference with the proper development of the State park system established in the Master Plan.
- 9. The cost of land should be reasonable, and in line with values in the section of the State in which the park site is located; and no donation of land shall be considered unless it meets all the requirements set forth herein for establishing new parks or recreation sites.
- 10. The difficulty and cost of future development, including such features as access, water supply, and sanitation, are as important in the selection of a park site as are such other factors as the inherent assets of the land and its acquisition cost.

Recreation Area - 1. A recreation area is one so designated because it does not meet all the criteria for a regional State park. Nevertheless it should be selected because of its geographical location, accessibility to large centers of population, and recreational potential.

- 2. No absolute minimum size is suggested, however, the site should be large enough to permit adequate development without overcrowding. It should also be large enough to prevent encroachments that would detract from its natural attractions.
- 3. A recreation area site should be susceptible to development for the intended use, providing a variety of forms of recreation.
- 4. The site is also enhanced if it contains historical features, but again this is not a controlling factor.
- 5. The cost of land and development should be reasonable in relation to similar costs in adjacent areas in the State.
- <u>Historic Site</u> 1. An historic site should commemorate an outstanding historic event or other feature, or portray past culture with which present and future generations are not or will not be familiar.
- 2. Historic sites should be selected only on the basis of their having State-wide or national significance. Items of purely local interest more properly should be the responsibility of local political subdivisions or local historical groups.
- 3. The size of the area should be sufficient to encompass the historical feature preserved, permitting adequate preservation, protection and public use.
- 4. Proposals for additional historic sites should be concurred in by the Maryland Historical Trust.

 $S_{ij} = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{ij}) \otimes S_{ij}(\mathcal{H}_{ij}) \otimes S_{ij}(\mathcal{H}_{ij})$

AREAS SELECTED

The Master Plan Committee, in accordance with the criteria established, selected the following areas within each classification. For convenient reference the areas are indicated on the accompanying State map. As will be noted, there are 15 regional State parks, 10 recreation areas, and five historic sites included in the Master Plan.

Regional State Parks	Recreation Areas	<u>Historic Sites</u>
Assateague Island	Cedarville	Gathland
Cunninghem Falls	Fort Frederick	General Smallwood
Deep Creek Lake	Gambrill	Fort Frederick
Elk Neck	James Island *	Washington Monument
Gunpowder	Martinak*	Wye Oak
Herrington Manor, including	Matapeake *	
Swallow Falls area	Milburn Landing	
New Germany	Pen Mar	
Patapsco	Rocks, including	
Patuxent	Falling Branch area	
Point Lookout *	Shads Landing	
Rocky Gap *	_	
Sandy Point		
Seneca Creek		
Susquehanna		
Tuckahoe Lake *		

^{*} Indicates additional regional parks or recreation areas not previously the responsibility of the State

OTHER AREAS

In addition to the specific designated areas above, the Master Plan Committee gave consideration to the several reservoirs in various sections of the State, such as Loch Raven, Liberty, Prettyboy, Tridelphia, and Rocky Gorge. These reservoir areas offer substantial recreational possibilities and it is felt they should be made available for such use. The Committee strongly recommends that the Commission and Department of Forests and Parks intensify their efforts to work out agreements with the responsible local authorities to make such reservoir areas available for wider recreational use.

The map referred to will be included in the final report

en de la composition La composition de la

 •			
			,
	t de la companya de l	·	

ting the second of the second

The Committee also gave recognition to large-scale park developments by Baltimore City and certain Counties, particularly those in the Baltimore and Washington areas. Some of these parks, particularly those in Baltimore City, meet regional park criteria and are recognized in this Report as serving a regional function in the over-all parks and recreation area requirements. *

* NOTE: Amended by action of the Committee on November 21, 1962, to include this paragraph.

·

in the second of the second was an estimated and the second of the secon

In its evaluation of existing and proposed park and recreation areas, the Master Plan Committee agreed that the following areas should be <u>excluded</u> from the Master Plan, with necessary action taken as indicated.

Casselman Bridge - This facility should be transferred to the State
Roads Commission for efficient maintenance
Dan's Mountain Recreation Area - This area should be donated to the
county or local community
Fort Tonoloway State Park - This facility should be donated to the
county or local community

Other proposed areas specifically excluded are:

Calvert Cliffs Green Ridge Morgan Run

Insofar as Calvert Cliffs is concerned, the Master Plan Committee felt that this area is of limited, highly specialized interest only and has no real potential for development either as a State park or recreation area. Accordingly it was agreed that it should not be included in the master plan. A proposed park site in Green Ridge State Forest was excluded because of its proximity to the regional park at Rocky Gap which will serve more conveniently a far greater segment of the population. The proposed Morgan Run area is situated close to both the Liberty Reservoir and the upper reaches of the Patapsco State Park, each of which areas offer excellent potential for recreational development. Because of this, the Committee felt strongly that it was unjustifiable at the present time to commit the State to the acquisition of a proposed 3,500 acre park in this area and agreed it should not be included in the master plan.

Moreover, in its deliberations the Master Plan Committee further agreed that four additional areas should be held in reserve for future consideration. Two of these areas should be considered on the basis of the land being donated to the State:

Pearces Creek - a proposed recreation area of some 500 acres in Cecil County, now in Federal ownership, which would provide about a mile of excellent beach \mathcal{C}^{\bullet} . The contraction \mathcal{C}^{\bullet} is the contraction of \mathcal{C}^{\bullet} . The contraction \mathcal{C}^{\bullet}

Principio Furnace - a proposed historic site in Cecil County, on which is located an old iron furnace built in 1715. It is also proposed that effort be made to interest the steel corporations in restoring the furnace

The third site is the Annapolis Rock-Greenbrier area. This area, part of the South Mountain watershed, should be held in reserve for the future and should not be developed at this time. It is possible that impounding facilities should be developed here, if demand calls for it, after the development of Cunningham Falls has been completed as a full-scale, all-purpose regional park. Finally, the fourth site is beach frontage in the area between Annapolis and Point Lookout, preferably situated in the vicinity of the West and Rhode Rivers. Such a beach front area should be of sufficient size to qualify as a regional type of park, and search for such a site should be expedited and the land acquired as soon as possible.

GENERAL PRIORITY CONSIDERATIONS

As indicated earlier, one of the principal shortcomings in Maryland has been the lack of <u>development</u> of existing park and recreation areas. The Master Plan Committee unanimously agreed that this deficiency must be overcome and that in the future emphasis should be given to developing the regional parks and other areas to their fullest recreational potential. This is not to say that the entire acreage of a park or recreation area should necessarily be developed. But specific areas within park sites should be selected for intensive development to provide for maximum public use.

It is recognized that such development cannot be accomplished all at once, and the Committee proposes that during 1962 a schedule of projects be worked out on a priority basis so as to accomplish this objective as rapidly as possible within the limits of financing available. In this connection the Committee proposes that several strategically located parks be selected for immediate full-scale development of specific areas.

The state of the s

At the same time it is also recognized that the acquisition of land for the selected regional parks and other areas is important and in certain instances, such as beach frontage, is of equal rank with development. Consequently a reasonable balance in any schedule of projects must be attained.

To develop a park system capable of meeting the recreational needs of the people of Maryland, the consultant estimates would require at current costs the expenditure of about \$31,000,000 during the next 10 years. The schedule advanced by him calls for capital outlays in the next several years averaging in excess of \$5,000,000 each year. The Master Plan Committee recognizes that annual capital outlays of such magnitude for recreation purposes are not practicable when considered in relation to the needs of the State's over-all capital budget. The Committee, at this time, has not had an opportunity to review carefully the details of the proposed projects and their estimated costs. It feels, however, that it is within the realm of possibility to bring down the total cost of the 10-year program to around \$25,000,000. This would mean a level of expenditure averaging about \$2,500,000 annually. In the belief that such an average annual level of expenditure for park and recreation purposes is reasonable, the Committee recommends that such a sum be appropriated in the capital budget each year for this purpose.

If this is done, preliminary calculations indicate that most all of the additional land needed can be acquired during the 1963 and 1964 fiscal years (except for long-term purchase of vast acreages such as Gunpowder State Park) and thereafter about \$1,000,000 of the proposed \$2,500,000 per year can be expended solely for development. It is the intent of the Committee that the Commission and Department of Forests and Parks follow the guidelines herein set forth.



> -